

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 were examined. All claims were rejected. In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicants cancel claims 1-10 and add new claims 11-23. Consideration of the new claims in light of the following remarks is requested.

I. Preliminary Matters

Applicants have provided an application data sheet listing their mailing addresses, as requested by the Examiner.

II. Support for New Claims

New claims 11-23 are added without adding new material. Support for the new claims is at the following paragraphs, and the claims are also supported by the material in the specification generally.

Claim	Supporting Paragraph(s)
11	[0031], [0033], [0035], [0048], [0051], [0062]
12	[0049]
13	[0032]
14	[0033]
15	[0034]
16	[0037], [0040], [0045], Fig. 3
17	[0043]
18	[0046]
19	[0046]
20	[0051]
21	[0059]
22	[0070]
23	[0079]

III. References of Record

The Examiner rejected now-canceled claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,601,233 to Underwood ("*Underwood*"). Applicants have reviewed the Examiner's citations to this lengthy reference, as well as the reference more generally, and believe that new claims 11-23 are patentable over *Underwood* for at least the following reasons.

Claim 11, the independent claim from which claims 12-23 depend directly or indirectly, recites a method comprising dynamically processing a database to eliminate missing values in records, each record to contain a plurality of values; preparing a statistical summary of processed data in the database; constructing a database structure to hold the statistical summary; searching through possible relationship models to find a high-scoring network; and using the high-scoring network to compute a decision for a new case. *Underwood* does describe certain database operations, but the operations recited in claim 11 are missing. For example, *Underwood* does not discuss dealing with missing values, preparing a statistical summary, or searching for a high-scoring network among possible relationship models. Finally, *Underwood* does not teach or suggest computing a decision for a new case by using the high-scoring network. For at least those reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is not anticipated by *Underwood* and request that this claim be allowed.

Claims 12-23 depend directly or indirectly from claim 11 and are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons mentioned in support of that base claim. Consideration and allowance of these dependent claims is also respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending, namely claims 11-23, patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Dated: Feb. 14th, 2006 Thomas M. Coester

Thomas M. Coester, Reg. No. 39,637

<p>12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor Los Angeles, California 90025 (310) 207-3800</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING</u></p> <p>I hereby certify that the correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage for first class mail, in an envelope addressed to:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Mail Stop RCE Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450</p> <p><u>Marilyn Bass</u> 02-14-06</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"><tr><td style="width: 80%;">Marilyn Bass</td><td style="width: 20%; text-align: right;">Date</td></tr></table>	Marilyn Bass	Date
Marilyn Bass	Date		